REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 8, 15, 21, 29 and 37 are indefinite. Dependent claims 2-9, 11-15, 17-23, 25-29 and 31-37 are unclear in that they depend from unclear dependent claims.

Applicants have amended the claims to correct typographical errors and as such, Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Figure 2 has been objected to as having a typographical error. Applicant submits a new Figure 2 correcting the typographical error.

Claims 1-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,744,077 (Fadem et al.). The Fadem reference is directed to a link flow control information put in a time slot protocol data transmission of a data processing network. Such a system is used for example, where there is a host processor and a plurality of terminals wherein the host processor supplying information to the plurality of terminals and overflows of information from the host can occur at the terminal element. As such, certain time slots are used for stopping the transmission of characters there being transmitted from the host computer to a terminal device at a rate faster than the rate at which they are first being outputted by the terminal device. As such, link flow control commands that control the flow of the information between the host and terminal elements are disclosed. Applicant claims a distinctly different methodology and apparatus. For example, as set forth in Applicant's preambles, Applicant's invention is directed towards, for example, a method for facilitating prevention of interception of incoming data that is provided for a software application. It does not appear that the Fadem reference is at all directed to the prevention of

interception of incoming data that is provided to a software application. To the contrary, it appears that the Fadem reference is dealing with the flow of information wherein the information all appears to be acceptable and actual data.

In contrast, Applicant's method and apparatus, among other advantages, can prevent keyboard sniffing applications and other applications attempting to intercept messages from a message queue of a particular application by inserting, for example, fake messages. A system can be independent of an operating system. Fadem is not directed to such a system. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

In addition, as to claims 1, 16 and 30, the Fadem reference has been cited as teaching a method or apparatus and storage medium for facilitating prevention of interception of incoming data. However, there is no column or line number identifying where Fadem teaches such a method or apparatus. As noted, it is likely due to the fact that Fadem is directed to a completely different system. Accordingly, the claims are in condition for allowance. Moreover, there is no teaching or suggestion of, among other things, providing insertion data for insertion as part of the incoming data and filtering received incoming data containing actual data and the insertion data. As claimed, the incoming data contains two types of information, actual data and insertion data and there is a filtering of this information. The Office Action cited col. 12, lines 45-52 as allegedly teaching this filtering operation. However, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not appear to indicate which data is the claimed actual data and which data is the claimed insertion data as allegedly taught by Fadem. As best can be understood, it appears that the Fadem reference simply uses actual data the entire time. In other words, the data being stroed in the received FIFO is the actual data that is being communication. The keystroke data, LFC carriers and ID bits are all set by, for example, the host or other device and are preset and identifiable in our actual

information sent by the host for example. There is no insertion data described and Fadem is claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, these claims are in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter and accordingly, these claims are also in condition for allowance. In addition, it does not appear to be mentioned as random data, for example, Applicant refers to claims, 6, 21 and 35. The cited portion of Fadem, namely, col. 13, lines 2-27, merely states that the information in the received FIFO is output into a data bus based on bits of an address. Applicant is unable to find any mention of any stored random data or any other reference to randomization of data as required by other claims. Accordingly, the claims are also in condition for allowance.

As per claims 10 and 24, Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above. Again, Applicant notes that the claims require, among other things, storing a list of data representing to be randomized, selecting data from the list of data as randomized insertion data. The Office Action cites col. 18 and col. 19 of Fadem. However, the cited portions of this reference again merely appear to teach that standard operations using flags is performed by the Fadem system. For example, the program determines if a LFC flag has been set and if so, a check is made to determine if the HRQ contents is less than eight. There is no discussion, teaching or suggestion of any randomization or random insertion data or data representing data to be randomized. Again, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims depending upon the independent claims are also believed to be allowable for the same reasons and in addition, they add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Date: November 12, 2003

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005
E-MAIL: creckamp@vedderprice.com